

Revisiting “Retranslation Hypothesis”: A Comparative Analysis of Stylistic Features in the Persian Retranslations of *Pride and Prejudice*

Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi¹, Amene Mohammadi²

¹Graduate Department, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza Branch, Shahreza, Iran

²Shaikhbahai University, Isfahan, Iran

Email: vahiddastjerdi7@gmail.com, happyamino@yahoo.com

Received April 5th, 2013; revised May 10th, 2013; accepted May 17th, 2013

Copyright © 2013 Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi, Amene Mohammadi. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

In the context of literary translation studies, a translation can be challenged at any time, which may lead to its retranslation. According to “Retranslation Hypothesis”, first translations tend to be more target-oriented than subsequent, more recent translations. Retranslations, the hypothesis claims, get closer to the source text, resulting in a more accomplished target text. Several different factors are found to make “Retranslation Hypothesis” possible. Yet the extent to which the Hypothesis is supported by empirical evidence is in question. Thus, the present study, in order to test the validity of “Retranslation Hypothesis” and supplementary nature of retranslations over time, as stated by Robinson (1999), selected three chapters of Austin’s classic novel, *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), together with its first and subsequent translations into Persian. The comparative analysis of three stylistic features (type/token ratio, average sentence length, speech representation) between the source and the translated texts was underpinned by Baker’s (2000) and Short’s (1996) methodologies for investigating style as a means of measuring degrees of closeness or divergence, and charting the treatment of the retranslation over time. In partial support of “Retranslation Hypothesis”, the findings of this study revealed a more source-text oriented nature for retranslations in an attempt of the translators to keep the original stylistic features intact. Thus, it can be claimed that the Hypothesis is valid to some extent in this respect. The findings of the present study may prove to be useful to the professional translators of foreign literary works in that they show the prevailing approach applied by the first and later translators. In addition, the findings can be of great help to the publishers and editors of literary translations, in terms of the necessity of producing retranslations over time or reprinting first translations.

Keywords: “Retranslation Hypothesis”; Retranslation; Stylistic Features; Supplementary Nature; Type/Token Ratio; Sentence Length; Speech Representation

Introduction

The “Retranslation Hypothesis” has been presented in an article by French scholar Berman (1990: p. 1), talking basically about literary retranslation. He claims that translation is an “incomplete” act and that it can only evolve through later translations. Completion to Berman refers to the success of a translation in getting closer to the source text (ST) and in representing the encounter between the translator and the language of the original (1990). He believes that all translations are marked with an inherent “failure” that is at its peak in its first translation (1990: p. 5). He further believes that subsequent translations pay more attention to the letter and style of the ST and keep a cultural distance between the translation and its source, emphasizing the otherness of the original (1990).

In his paper, Robinson (1999: p. 1) states, “standard assumption about retranslation is that it is undertaken when an existing translation, comes to be widely perceived as outdated.” Based on this idealized model of translation, the original is considered “timeless,” while translation is for its own time only (1999: p.

2). Later he takes a critical stance on this ideal model and regards it rather simplistic, since literary classics in opposition to the claim of “Retranslation Hypothesis” may be retranslated for a whole host of reasons, only some of which are related to the passage of time (1999). Robinson goes even further and continues to clash the idea of timeless original by considering the role of retranslations in changing the target culture and literary system (1999). Hence, an “updated *conception* of the original” is mandatory as well which leads us to the conclusion that the original ST is “no longer the stable [timeless] referent point” rather it is a “reciprocal product of interactive rethinking in a shifting present” (1999: p. 4). Keeping Supplementary nature of retranslations in the foreground, Robinson (1999) speaks of three models of retranslations as temporal supplementarity, quantitative supplementarity, and qualitative supplementarity, which refer to updating and modernization of previous translations, getting more of the original’s semantics, style, and beauty, respectively. In other words supplementarity as Robinson (1990) put it is getting more of the original’s properties than the prede-

cessor translation (Robinson, 1999).

Implied in "Retranslation Hypothesis" is the paradigm of idealism, namely the further we get away from the time the ST was created and the more it is retranslated, the better translation will be achieved (Vándor, 2009). In other words, the more we translate the better results we get and eventually we get access to an ideal translation, i.e., a translation that its goal is to achieve "perfect identity with the original" (Goethe cited in Schulte & Biguenet, 1992).

Apparently, "Retranslation Hypothesis" is based on the intuitive observation of many cases which follow this schema. As Koskinen and Paloposki (2004) point out even the reasons behind it sound plausible. If a ST appears to be foreign or alien in the target culture, a more domesticated comprehensive version of translation is often expected and later translations seem to benefit from increased familiarity with the source culture.

Contrary to the existence of many cases that conform to the underlying assumptions of "Retranslation Hypothesis", there are still several other cases which stand in the opposite direction (Koskinen & Paloposki, 2010). Therefore, a number of researchers to whom "Retranslation Hypothesis" is untenable criticizes the assumed chronological development of it. This might also hold to be true in the case of Persian-English-Persian literary multiple translations.

Regarding Robinson's latter qualitative supplementarity classification of models of translations, the present study, attempted to test the validity of "Retranslation Hypothesis" with regard to stylistic aspects of the original text. It therefore sought to answer the following questions:

- 1) Is retranslation supplemented stylistically according to the moral level of stylistic analysis?
- 2) Does retranslation lead to an ideal translation?

Background of the Study

Motives for Retranslations

Generally, Berman (1990) takes three main reasons in to account for rendering a new translation of the already translated texts. He primarily speaks of historical, interpretive, and recapitulation-oriented grounds as specific justifications for the act of retranslation. He puts emphasis on the issue of aging translations with the passage of time, and eternal "young" ST as a major motivation for rendering new translations.

By contrast, Brownlie (2006) points out that changing social contexts and the evolution of translation norms are major factors leading to retranslate a previously translated text. Pym also gives some explanation on the reasons for retranslation act "ranging from different pedagogical functions of texts to rivalry in the possession of the knowledge contained in the document to be translated" (1998: pp. 82-83). Other reasons for retranslations, as Kujamäki (2001) claims, are ideological and political factors that give rise to a need for retranslation of canonical literary texts in particular.

Retranslations may also be published in order to reassert the power and authority of certain social institutions such as academic, feminist, and religious establishments (Venuti, 2003). Retranslations commissioned with the awareness of the predecessor translations, Venuti maintains, "justify themselves by establishing their differences from one or more previous versions" and that this difference emerges from retranslation strategies leading to competing interpretations formed on the assumption of

unacceptability of previous versions" (2003: pp. 25-26). Retranslators may also set out to displace the prevailing translation norms in a given culture (2003).

Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) argue that the possible reason behind the act of retranslation is that if a ST appears to be foreign or alien in the target culture, a more domesticated comprehensive version of translation is often expected and later translations seem to benefit from increased familiarity with the source culture. Therefore, acquainting with the culture of ST is seen as another reason for retranslation act.

The role of publishing houses which are attracted by prestige, cost effectiveness, and guaranteed sales associated with the publication of literary classics is also another reason to retranslate or recycle existing translations (Milton, 2001; Koskinen & Paloposki, 2003; Venuti, 2003).

Yet another reason for retranslation is the fact that the translator is considered as an established author in the TT (Vanderschelden, 2000). Dean (2010) points out that the underlying motivations for the act of retranslation arise from "the tangle of both intrinsic (linguistic and cultural), and extrinsic (para and extra textual) variables".

Five main arguments have been put forward to justify retranslation. Retranslation, thus, is acceptable if 1) The existing translation is unsatisfactory (in terms of errors of comprehension, changes in perception and target language norms over years); 2) A new edition of ST is published and becomes a standard reference; 3) The existing TT is considered outdated from stylistic point of view; 4) Retranslation has a special function to fill in the target language (e.g. synchronic retranslations for British and American market); 5) A different interpretation of ST is plausible (Vanderschelden, 2000: pp. 5-6). Retranslations, as she explains, can also contribute to the revival of interests in a forgotten literary text, and publishers use them as a positive literary device (2000).

"Retranslation Hypothesis" and the Underlying Assumptions

When talking about "Retranslation Hypothesis" one must mention Bensimon (1990), Berman (1990), Gambier (1994), and Chesterman (2000) as the ones who introduced and formulated "Retranslation Hypothesis".

Theoretical assumptions on retranslation were discussed in a special issue of the journal *Palimpsestes* in 1990 by Berman and Bensimon whose position on retranslation is briefly what constitutes the basis for the so-called "Retranslation Hypothesis" (Koskinen & Paloposki, 2003; Brownlie, 2006).

Berman (1990: pp. 1-7) argues that translation is an "incomplete act" and in order to accomplish the task of translation the only way is through setting out retranslations over time. He admits that first translations date hence, the need for new translations (1990). By "accomplishment" he means the success of a translation in getting closer to the source text and in representing the encounter between the translator and the language of the original (1990: p. 3). He also puts emphasis on an inherent "failure" marking all translations and points out that this "failure" is at its peak in the first translation, reflecting the "incapacity" and "resistance" to translate (1990: p. 5).

In the same issue of *Palimpsestes*, dealing with retranslation, Bensimon (1990: p. ix) speaks of first translations as "naturalization of the foreign works" which serves to introduce them into given target culture. Hence, first translations in his view

are introductions seeking to integrate one culture into another, to ensure positive reception of the work in the target culture. Subsequent translations, on the other hand, pay more attention to the letter and style of the ST and maintain a cultural distance between the translation and its source (1990).

“Retranslation Hypothesis” is formulated more explicitly in an evaluation by Gambier (1994: p. 414) “... first translation always tends to be more assimilating, tends to reduce the otherness in the name of cultural and editorial requirements... The translation, in this perspective would mark a *return* to the source text” (emphasis in the text). First translations, therefore, are assumed to feature cuts and challenges that are motivated by a concern for higher levels of readability (1994). He suggests a number of starting points for testing “Retranslation Hypothesis”, i.e. retranslations are carried out due to our increased knowledge of source languages or to offer a new interpretation. First option seems to be more in line with “Retranslation Hypothesis” whereas the second one tends to other solutions. This view brings to fore a model of retranslation as an improvement process over time and is based on the idea of an “immanent meaning” contained in the ST (Gambier, 1994).

Implied in “Retranslation Hypothesis” is the paradigm of idealism, namely the further we get away from the time the ST was created and the more it is retranslated, the better translation will be achieved (Vándor, 2009). In other words, the more we translate the better results we get and sooner or later we get access to an ideal translation.

According to Goethe (cited in Schulte & Biguenet, 1992) there are three epoch of translation of the same ST over a period. The first one makes known “the country of the foreign” to the target readers on their own terms. The second kind of translation belongs to the era in which the translator attempts to “place himself into the foreign situation but actually only appropriates the foreign idea and represents it as his own”. The third epoch of translation is the highest of the three in which the goal of the translation is to achieve “perfect identity with the original” and “ultimately comes close to an interlinear version and greatly facilitates our understanding of the original.”

Supplementary and Improvement: The Difference

As mentioned above, Gambier (1994) suggested a model of retranslation as an improvement process through the course of time. According to what Gambier (1994) stated, the motives for retranslation is the increased knowledge of the source languages and cultures as well as to offer a new interpretation (1994). In other words, as Hanson, Malmkjar, Gile (2004: p. 34) state, retranslations are “somehow more adequate or mature than those produced in the previous era.”

Another term frequently used in “Retranslation Hypothesis”, which might be confused with retranslations’ improvement process over time, is the “supplementarity” nature of retranslations. As Koskinen and Paloposki (2003) put it, the concept of the supplementarity of different translations refers to “the targeting of different versions to different sections of the audience, and of categorizing a text either as a classic or children literature” (2003: pp. 22-23). The notion of supplementarity in their view refers to simultaneous function of texts and their interpretations on several layers, which criticize easy classification of translated texts into assimilative first, and source text oriented new translators. In other words, it can be seen as complementing

and/or reorienting the source texts in the subsequent translations.

The term is also differently used by Robinson (1999) in his model of retranslation. He claims that retranslation comes to be conceived and presented either rhetorically (quantitatively) or qualitatively rather than temporally supplemental, i.e. it captures more of the original properties than the predecessor translations. The prevalent directionality in his model of retranslation is supplementarity, as Robinson (1999: p. 2) claimed “... previous translations have only partially rendered, and presents the retranslation as much-needed supplement that captures more of the original’s timeliness (temporal supplementarity), semantics and/or syntax (quantitative supplementarity), or spark, genius, élan, or je ne sais quoi (qualitative supplementarity)”. By qualitative supplementarity, he means getting more of the original’s style and beauty. It is worth pointing out the present study focused on the concept of supplementarity as stated by Robinson (1999).

Method

Materials

In order to select a text that conforms to the aim of a research, restrictions have to be applied. Therefore, the fiction novel *Pride and prejudice* (1813), written by 19th century English woman writer, Austin, translated by Mosaahab (1955) and retranslated by Pooranfar and Adel poor (2007) was chosen for the purpose of this study.

Model of the Study

For the purposes of the present research, it was crucial to understand that there are different traditions of stylistic research, which influence the limits, and ambitions of a stylistic study as well as methods used in stylistic analysis. Generally speaking, two types of linguistic and literary (poetic) stylistics was distinguished (cited in Miššiková, 2003). The researchers applied Short’s (1996) analytical methods of linguistic stylistics in which he works exclusively with literary texts such as poetry, fiction, and drama (cited in Miššiková 2003), together with Baker’s methodology for investigating style (2000). Therefore, the model of the present study is a hybrid one. Three linguistic stylistic markers were thus selected to represent the micro-level of stylistic analysis, i.e. Type/Token Ratio (TTR), Average Sentence Length (ASL), and Speech Representation (SR). The particular line of investigation the present study followed is however different from that of the Baker’s (2000) corpus study for investigating translator’s style in that hers focused on identifying linguistic patterns of a translator regardless of SR and the possible influence of the source language and/or the author’s style. The present study thus borrowed, in addition to Short’s (1996) proposed features, Baker’s identified stylistic patterns of a literary translator and investigated the relative match of the source and target texts and relative success of the latter in reproducing the style of the former. Actually, since the focus of this study is “Retranslation Hypothesis” (RH) and testing the degree to which first and later translations preserve the stylistic features of the original text in translation, the researchers investigated the general stylistic markers (TTR, ASL, SR) first in the ST, and then in the first and later translations for potential match between the source and target texts.

Procedures

In order to carry out the study, random sampling was employed. Actually, three chapters (chapters three, forty four, and fifty five) of the novel *Pride and Prejudice* and their corresponding renderings in the first and subsequent Persian translations were selected. Then, three general stylistic markers of TTR, ASL, and SR were identified manually by the researchers first in the ST, next in the first and later translations and tabulated in a number of tablets. To calculate TTR, first the number of tokens, i.e. total number of words of the text, and then the number of types, i.e. the number of different words of the texts was counted in the ST and TTs. Since TTR is sensitive to the length of the text (in larger texts TTR tends to be lower) the researchers applied the related formula to the texts of the same length, in which the number of tokens is the same in both the source and target translations. Following that, the ratio of different words to total words was calculated, multiplied by one hundred, and tabulated for each text. This was done to compare and contrast the vocabulary richness of the author, translator, and re-translator.

To specify the Average Sentence Length (ASL), the punctuation marks were used to identify the boundary of sentences. The researchers actually classified syntactic structures into three types: 1) sentences ended with Full Stop; 2) sentences ended with Exclamation Mark and 3) sentences ended with Question Mark. The total number of FSs, EMs, and QMs was counted in the three selected chapters and tabulated. Then, the total number of words was determined by performing word segmentation on both the original and translated texts. Finally, the ASL was calculated by dividing the total number of words to the total number of punctuation marks. It was done to specify the average length of the author's and translators' sentences. By comparing the length of sentences with Butler's (1985) three categories of sentence length as short, medium, and long, the present study specified whether the translator and/or re-translator have kept the style of the author intact in this respect.

To identify the SR, the researchers applied Short's categorization of speech representation (1996, 2005), dividing "reporting speech" of the original text and its first and later translations into five groups of 1) Narrator's Representation of Speech (NRS); 2) Direct Speech (DS); 3) Free Direct Speech; 4) Indirect Speech (IS); and 5) Free Indirect Speech (FIS), accordingly. Then the number of SR in each group was counted and tabulated in tables, and the percentage of use of each group was calculated in the original novel and the translated texts. This was done to figure out which translation is closer to the original novel in terms of preserving the author's style of representation of speech.

It is to be noted finally that in the course of data analysis, two main lines were followed: the collected data were analyzed quantitatively in terms of calculating TTR and ASL, and both quantitatively and qualitatively in terms of identifying and calculating the number and percentage of SR's groups.

Results and Discussion

Type/Token Ratio

Table 1 statistically displays the total number of tokens, types and TTR derived from the selected chapters of *Pride and Prejudice* and its translations by Mosaahab and Pooraanfar.

Table 1.
TTR in ST and TTs.

	Austin	Mosaahab	Pooraanfar
Tokens	5505	5505	5505
Types	1006	985	1001
TTR	54.7	55.8	54.9

As **Table 1** shows, TTR is higher for Mosaahab (55.8), while it is almost the same for Austin and Pooraanfar (i.e. 54.7 and 54.9 respectively).

The results of the present study showed that one obvious difference between the author and the first translator concerned the overall type/token ratio. In **Table 1**, one can see that there seems to be a strong preference in using a wider range of vocabulary for Mosaahab due to her overall type/token ratio (55.8). Since, according to Baker (2000: p. 250), "a high type/token ratio means the writer uses a wider range of vocabulary [and] a low type/token ratio means that a writer draws on a more restricted set of vocabulary items", the researchers found that Mosaahab, the first translator, enjoys more distinct words in her translation.

In contrast, figures presented in **Table 1** revealed that the overall TTR is lower for Pooraanfar, the re-translator, with a restricted variation among individual words. This is largely true of the original writer with even a lower TTR. It is worth mentioning that the focus of the present study was not to exactly determine the vocabulary richness of the original writer and the two translators, but to make a comparison and contrast between them to find any probable stylistic similarities and differences in this respect. Through figures in **Table 1**, one can find that although TTR varies between the source and the retranslated text, the variation is not much considerable. The apparent similarity between the original author and Pooraanfar in the range and use of vocabulary might be an indication of a direct reflection of the ST in Pooraanfar's retranslation.

Unlike Pooraanfar's restricted range of vocabulary, Mosaahab enjoyed more distinct words in the first translation, since TTR is higher for Mosaahab, with more variation among individual words. This is quite stylistically revealing, most probably because she has been under the influence of target (Persian) stylistic norms of the time or of her individual style of writing. Her choice of lexical items with a higher frequency of occurrence in the original Persian novels of the time might be considered as another indication of her impression from the target stylistic norms, which, in fact, is beyond the concern of this study. At any rate, according to what Berman (1990) states about target-oriented translation, Mosaahab's first translation seems to be a more target oriented one, applying target stylistic norms of the time in terms of the writer's lexical diversity, thus trying to naturalize the source text' style of writing. While the re-translator attempted to produce a more source-oriented translation, as Berman (1990) puts it, in terms of the general stylistic feature of the writer's lexical diversity, keeping the foreign flavor of the original.

Average Sentence Length

Stylistic analysis has inherited other types of measurements from corpus linguistics, a good example of which is ASL. It accounts for a writer's stylistic pattern of constructing and presenting sentences in a text. A writer might face three choices of

sentence length ranging from long and medium to succinct sentences. Hemingway's style of using succinct sentences in his novels such as *The Old Man and the Sea* is a paradigmatic representation of the function of ASL in stylistic analysis.

The following table illustrates the total number of words, punctuation marks, and average sentence length (ASL) in three chapters of the novel *Pride and prejudice* and its first and later translation by Mosaahab and Pooraanfar, respectively.

Table 2 shows that the average sentence length in Mosaahab's translation is lower than that of Austin, i.e. 18.09. It is also evident that the total number of words in the three chapters of the later translation by Pooraanfar has increased to 6698 and thus, ASL has risen to 20.69, which are closer to that of Austin.

According to Butler (1985) sentences are grouped into three categories by length, i.e. short (1-9 words), medium (10-25 words), and long (more than 25 words). By looking at the figures presented in **Table 2**, it gets clear that Austin's overall average length of sentences falls into Butler's medium category. The above results reveal the same thing, i.e. both the first translator and the re-translator have had a general tendency to use medium sentences in the target translated texts. The obtained figures did not show a great distinction between ASL in the ST and the translated ones. However, the variation in statistics for the first translation ($20.01 - 18.09 = 1.92$) is stylistically significant, because it is an indication of a minimized ASL in Mosaahab's style of writing in contrast to the original author's. This might be again due to the translator's own style of writing or the stylistic norms of the time. The possible justification for the findings might be again target stylistic norms of writing of the time and the Mosaahab's preference of readability of the text to the target audience over the faithfulness to the writer's style of presenting the length of sentences. According to Berman (1990) and Venuti (1995), the first translator tries to naturalize the ST. In other words, a transparent, fluent style is adopted in order to minimize the foreignness of ST. In contrast, the larger amount of ASL in Pooraanfar's retranslation (20.69) made it apparent to the researchers that the re-translator prioritized the style of the source author and the original text. The longer average sentence length used by Pooraanfar also was an evidence to illustrate the re-translator's strategies to make the ST more explicit to the target readers. Thus, according to Berman (1990) and Venuti (1995), Pooraanfar preserved "alien" features of the ST in order to convey the foreignness of the original.

Speech Representation

According to Wright (2010), Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* is a combination of narrative techniques to create effectively the impression of a social world inhabited by a variety of characters.

Table 2.
ASL in ST and TTs.

	Austin	Mosaahab	Pooraanfar
Full stops	227	337	297
Exclamation marks	39	13	10
Question marks	9	12	18
Number of punctuation	275	362	325
Number of words	5505	6552	6698
Average sentence length	20.01	18.09	20.69

The novel is written in the third person, where the narrator is not an actual character in the story, but an omniscient separate entity, allowing the reader to enter a particular character's mind. To achieve reality, she considerably employs dialogue in the novel *Pride and Prejudice* (Reni, 2007). As one can see, the first chapter of *Pride and Prejudice* is almost entirely in dialogue, "allowing the reader to engage the audience immediately by enacting the characters" (Michelson, 1990: p. 71). Reni states that's since Austin was after a realistic depiction of her characters and their surroundings, she had to find gradations of the ordinary dialogue between the characters. Therefore, the dialogue in *Pride and Prejudice* is expanded with direct and indirect presentation of speech. One of the indirect techniques of speech representation, which is credited by her inventing, is her use of free indirect speech, FIS (Michelson, 1990).

Table 3 below contrasts the percentage of occurrence of the SR classifications in Austin's novel, Mosaahab's first translation, and Pooraanfar's retranslation.

Looking closely at **Table 3** makes it clear that the percentage of variation in SR is much considerable at NRS, DS, and FDS for both the first and later translators. Also, the percentage of the occurrence DS in the ST (32.72%), is an indication of extensive use of direct speech in the foreign work. The almost higher percentage of 50.54 for NRS also shows the stylistic preference of the author to present narrator representation of speech for the scenes, which does not demand impressive reading. Thus, extensive use of NRS in the original novel helped the audience to read the novel with more rapidity. The third cell of the same row (**Table 3**) contains the percentage of the use of FDS in the ST (12.36%) is a signal of the minimized narrator's influence on the character's speech. According to what Short (1996) states, FDS is "used to accentuate the reported clause by delivering it from the presence of the narrator without withdrawing the contextual information the reader needs to consider the text coherent and without causing confusion or reader difficulty..." (p. 304). Based on the figures of the same table, one can find that the percentage of the use of IS is very low, under 1 percent (.72%). In other words, the author used restricted number of IS in her narrative. This is done by the author to show the minor status of the reported words and to offer the reader a fluent reading. Finally, the table shows that the percentage of the use of FIS is not much considerable (3.63) for the ST. Originally introduced by Austin, FIS is utilized in a restricted number of narrative sentences of the *Pride and Prejudice* with the form of narrative report to indicate indirectness as well as freeness of speeches. One of the significant effects of applying this technique on a text is the use of FIS as a means for imposing irony (Reni, 2007). As Leech and Short (1981) put it "This ability to give the flavour of the character's words but also to

Table 3.
Percentage of occurrence of the SR classifications for Austin, Mosaahab, and Pooraanfar.

Speech representation categories	Austin	Mosaahab	Pooraanfar
Narrator representation of speech	50.54	62.15	58.76
Direct Speech	32.72	25.13	27.38
Free direct speech	12.36	8.25	9.53
Indirect speech	.72	.82	.64
Free indirect speech	3.63	3.59	3.69

keep the narrator in an intervening position between character and reader makes FIS an extremely useful vehicle for casting ironic light on what the character says" (pp. 326-327). In fact, "the narrator has the possibility to let his own opinion slip into the character's words without changing them into IS" (Reni, 2007: p. 7). Hence, the ironical tone-considered as a stylistic feature of the macro level of stylistic analysis of a text of the novel can be in part assigned to the Author's use of FIS in her narrative style.

Compared to the findings of the present study, concerning the percentage of each SR category occurrence in the original novel, *Pride and Prejudice*, and based on the second row of **Table 3**, the researchers came to know that there is almost a great difference between the first translator's tendency to use NRS, DS, and FDS and that of the original author's. It is obvious that the percentage of NRS for Mosaahab (62.15) considerably exceeds that of Austin (50.54). This might be due to the fact that the first translator attempted to shorten the length of the narrative sentences by cutting them to small individual sentences in order to increase the text readability to the target readers as the target stylistic norms of the time necessitates. The second cell of the same row represents the percentage of the first translator use of DS (25.13). As it is seen, the frequency of DS occurrence in the first translation by Mosaahab has noticeably decreased compared to that of Austin. This reduction in the amount of DS occurrence in the first translation is an indication of the decreasing degree of reality and vividness of the character's words in the first translation. Also, the percentage of FDS occurrence (8.25) in the first translation differs from that of the ST (12.36). This, in fact, is because the first translator made the translated text more explicit. The difference of percentage in the first translation of IS and FIS is not much considerable which shows the increase and decrease in the occurrence of IS (.82%) and FIS (3.59%) percentage, respectively, compared to that of Austin. This reveals there was not much stylistic shift from the ST in terms of the last two SR categories, i.e. IS and FIS. In other words, the first translator kept the level of speech indirectness as well as the ironic tone of the original text in the translated one.

The third row of the table also contains the percentage of SR categories occurrence in the retranslation by Pooraanfar. Looking at the table vertically, one finds out that SR percentage of occurrence in retranslation has undergone almost the same changes in the first translation, compared to that of the ST. Actually, the percentage for NRS tends to increase for the retranslation, i.e. (58.76), which is in part due to the re-translator's tendency towards expansion and explicitation of the ST in the retranslated TT. From the second cell of the same row, it becomes evident that the percentage of using DS has been decreased in Pooraanfar's retranslation. The lower frequency of DS in the retranslation indicates that the degree and level of presenting reality in the retranslation have slightly been decreased compared to the source work. The difference of FDS between the retranslation and the original novel, *pride and prejudice*, is shown in the same table, i.e. (12.36 - 9.53 = 2.83). It is, in fact, indicative of the re-translator's tendency towards making the retranslated text more explicit than the ST makes. A vertical glance at the table reveals that the degree of the re-translator's explicitness is still lower than the first translator's explicitness, since the percentage of FDS occurrence in Mosaahab's first and Pooraanfar's retranslation is 8.25 and 9.53 respectively. Just like Mosaahab's first translation, the percentage of IS (.64) and

FIS (3.69) occurrence in the retranslation does not show much variation, compared to that of the ST. This, in fact, shows that less stylistic shift from the ST has occurred in the use of IS and FIS in the retranslation. It is to be added that the re-translator has tried much to preserve the style of the ST in terms of speech representation, hence applying a more source-oriented strategy of translation in conveying the author's style. In contrast, the greater variation in the percentage of the use of SR on the part of the first translator makes it quite clear that Mosaahab has not cared much for keeping the style of the original text in terms of SR. This is because she has tried to naturalize the style of the ST according to the stylistic norms of the target language, thus making the first translation more target-oriented than the retranslation.

Revisiting "Retranslation Hypothesis"

As mentioned earlier, "Retranslation Hypothesis" was introduced and formulated by a number of translation scholars such as Berman (1990), Bensimon (1990), and Gambier (1994) based on the observed schema of domesticated first translation, and foreignized retractions. According to Berman (1990: p. 1), translation is "an incomplete act and it can only strive for completion through retractions." Based on what he stated (1990), completion is achieved through the process of getting closer to the ST. Similarly, Bensimon (1990) claimed that first translations of the literary texts are more domesticating than the later retranslation of the same texts. As he puts it first translations are "the naturalization of the foreign works"; they are "introductions" trying to integrate the source culture into the target culture, to ensure positive reception of the work in the target culture (1990: p. ix). Retranslations of the same originals do not need to address the issue of introducing the text; they can maintain the cultural distance, instead. Therefore, subsequent retractions pay more attention to the letter and style of the ST (1990). Gambier (1994) claimed exactly the same process of domesticating first and foreignizing subsequent translations, as he put it "... first translations always tends to be more assimilating, tends to reduce the otherness in the name of cultural and editorial requirements... The translation in this perspective would mark a return to the source text" (p. 414).

The present study, as far as "Retranslation Hypothesis" is concerned, focused on the question of the degree of assimilation and foreignization observable in the first and later translation of an English novel, merely in terms of the assimilation to the stylistic features of the ST. It also sought the supplementary nature (getting more of the original) of the retranslation by analyzing the data collected from the selected chapters of the original English novel, and its two first and later translations. The findings came to be in line with the claim made by "Retranslation Hypothesis" that first translations are more domesticating than retractions, i.e. the researchers found that retractions in this study were more foreignizing than the first translation in terms of the three stylistic markers of TTR, ASL, and SR. Also, the findings showed to fit in the RH schema. It means that the retranslation of the foreign work seems to be more foreignizing, keeping the flavour of the foreign. Furthermore, the findings provided support for Robinson's claim (1999) that retractions are undertaken for a number of reasons, only some of which are related to out-datedness of the first translation. According to Robinson (1999), three models of retractions are possible concerning the supplementarity nature of re-

translations, i.e. temporal, quantitative, and qualitative supplementarity. Qualitative supplementarity refers to getting more of the original style and beauty. It is quite clear that retranslations in the present study have qualitatively been supplemented in terms of style as they are more source-text oriented, matching the original text's style properties than the first translation.

It is to be noted however that the findings of this study should not necessarily be regarded as a full proof for the validity of "Retranslation Hypothesis", for some counter-examples might be found in other similar studies to the effect that the whole issue of domestication/assimilation versus foreignization/source-text orientation is irrelevant. Besides, the findings of this study by no means guarantee a better retranslation in the target context for as Susam-Sarajeva (2003: p. 48) puts it, even the notion of retranslation as a "unidirectional move towards 'better' target text" and "... somehow more adequate and mature [translation]" does not have a general value, since it is not the case for all translations for sure.

Conclusion

As stated before, "Retranslation Hypothesis" founded its base on the assumption of assimilating first and source-oriented subsequent translations. As RH claims, it is so because the first translation serves as an introduction of the foreign work to the target readers, hence the need for new source-oriented retranslation in which the focus is on the letter and style of the ST. Furthermore, RH highlighted the supplementarity nature of retranslations over time, had they been more source-oriented than the predecessor translations. The present study, in order to examine the validity of "Retranslation Hypothesis" about assimilating first translations and the ST orientation of the retranslations and its accomplishment over time, chose a first translation and a retranslation of the novel, *Pride and Prejudice*. In order to test the degree of assimilation and source-text orientation strategies in the first and later translations, the researchers concentrated solely on the treatment of three general stylistic features in all three selected chapters of the first and subsequent translations. The model chosen for the analysis of the possible stylistic similarities and differences between the ST, the first and later translations as well as for the type of strategy applied for the translation of the three stylistic markers of TTR, ASL, and SR was an integration of Baker's (2000) model of investigating style in translation and Short's (1996) stylistic model of representing speech in narration. Baker (2000) suggested that her model of stylistic analysis of literary translations concerns the pattern of linguistic choices in literary translation, which should next be compared directly with the ST to depict the potential influence of the source language and/or writer's style. The first two stylistic markers investigated in the present study were thus borrowed from her model of stylistic investigation in translation. But, the third stylistic feature analyzed concentrated on the Short's categories of speech representation (SR), i.e. NRS, DS, FDS, IS, and FIS. Based on the obtained findings, the following conclusions were drawn in connection with the posed research questions:

1) The findings demonstrated a qualitatively supplemented retranslation. The retranslation in this study was source-oriented rather than target-oriented. The degree of assimilation of the foreign text (English novel) to the translating language (Persian language) was much more in the first translation compared with the retranslations. It can thus be concluded that the major

concern in the first translation was "readability" of the translated text. Therefore, the existing target text is considered unsatisfactory from stylistic point of view, leading to a new translation, which is closer to the style of the source text. This, indeed, confirms what Bellos (1994) stated about first translation as a hot translation which often favours readability and about retranslations as cold ones which seem to return to the source text literally, in an attempt to preserve its structure and style.

2) What is implied in "Retranslation Hypothesis" is the notion of idealism, i.e. the further we get away from the time the source text was produced and the more it is retranslated, the better translation we get (Berman, 1990, Bellos, 1994 & Gambier, 1994). Theoretically it is true that as time passes more progress in translation theories and intertextual relation can be seen. Although the findings of the present study showed supplementarity in terms of style in retranslation, it does not guarantee a better translation. Besides, it does not give support to the idea that supplementarity occurred due to the increased knowledge of the re-translator of the source text through the course of time compared to the first translator.

3) Regarding "Retranslation Hypothesis" the results obtained from the present study were almost in line with the hypothesis claims. According to "Retranslation Hypothesis" retranslations were expected to be more source-text oriented than the first translation of the same work. What was depicted through this study implied that retranslations got nearer to the stylistic properties of the source text for all the three stylistic markers, while the first translation kept more distance from the source text's style to ensure the positive reception of the translated text in the target context.

Generally, according to what Bensimon and Berman (1990) believed; namely, retranslations are made to emphasize the "otherness" of the source text which was lost in the first translation, it can be concluded that the source text "otherness" is one of the reasons which causes the retranslation to happen.

A final word is that although the findings of this study support RH claims, there are still other counter-examples, which contradict the results (see Brownlie, 2006; Hadizade, 2009). As Paloposki and Koskinen (2003, 2004) concluded in their research, there are numerous retranslations in line with the RH schema, but there also exist many examples to the contrary. Therefore, at least it can be concluded that the Hypothesis is not yet proved to be an absolute reality in translation. In order to establish "Retranslation Hypothesis" as a universally-accepted truth, further empirical researches need to be carried out.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. (1813). *Pride and prejudice*. www.manybooks.net
 Baker, M. (2000). Towards a methodology for investigating the style of literary translator. *Target*, 12, 241-266. doi:10.1075/target.12.2.04bak
 Bellos, D. (1994). Some like it hot: Hot and cold translations. *The Burns Conference*.
 Bensimon, P. (1990). Presentation. *Palimpsestes*, 4, ix-xiii.
 Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de traduction. *Palimpsestes*, 13, 1-7.
 Brownlie, S. (2006). Narrative theory and retranslation theory. *Across Languages and Culture*, 7, 140-170. doi:10.1556/Acr.7.2006.2.1
 Butler, C. (1985). *Statistics Linguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 Chesterman, A. (2000). A casual model for translation studies. In M. Olohan (Ed.), *Intercultural Faultlines*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
 Dean, S. H. (2010). Retranslations of Gustave Flaubert and George

- Sand in the British Literary System. Ph.D. Thesis.
<http://www.Llc.ed.ac.uk/graduateschool/translationstudies/Sharon.htm>
- Gambier, Y. (1994). La Retraduction, re Tour et de Tour. *Meta*, 39, 413-417. doi:10.7202/002799ar
- Hadizade, S. (2009). An investigation into "retranslation hypothesis" a study of the degree of visibility in literary translation. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Sheikh Bahaiee University.
- Koskinen, K., & Paloposki, O. (2003). Retranslation in the age of digital reproduction. *Cadernos*, 1, 19-38.
- Koskinen, K., & Paloposki, O. (2004). Thousand and one translations: Revisiting Retranslation. In G. Hansen, K. Malmkjaer, & D. Gile, (Eds.), *Claims, changes and challenges* (pp. 27-38). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koskinen, K., & Paloposki, O. (2010). Reprocessing texts. The fine line between retranslating and revising. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 11, 29-49. doi:10.1556/Acr.11.2010.1.2
- Michelson, P. (1990). Reading pride and prejudice. *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 3. <http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/ecf/vol3/iss1/1>
 doi:10.1353/ecf.1990.0049
- Milton, J. (2001). Translating classic fiction for mass markets. The Brazilian clube do livro. *The Translator*, 7, 43-69.
- Miššiková, G. (2003). *Linguistic stylistics*. UKF: Nitra.
- Pym, A. (1998). *Method in translation history*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Reni, E. (2007). The presentation of speech and thought in Jane Austen's "Pride and Prejudice" and in Joe Wright's Film Adaptation. Munich: GRIN Publishing GmbH.
- <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/85409/the-presentation-of-speech-and-thought-in-jane-austen-s-pride-and-prejudice>
- Robinson, D. (1999). Retranslation and ideosomatic drift. www.umass.edu/french/people/profiles/documents/Robinson.pdf
- Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. London: Longman.
- Short, M. (2005). *Corpus stylistics: A corpus-based study of speech, thought and writing presentation in narratives*. London: Routledge.
- Schulte, R., & Biguenet, J. (1992). *Theories of translation. An Anthology of essays from dryden to derrida*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Susam-Sarajeva, S. (2003). Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory: Retranslations of literary and cultural theories. *Target*, 15, 1-36.
 doi:10.1075/target.15.1.02sus
- Vanderschelden, I. (2000). Why retranslate the French classics? The impact of retranslation on quality. In: M. Salma-Carr (Ed.), *On Translating French Literature and Film II*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Vándor, J. (2010). *Adaptation and retranslation*. Ph.D. Thesis, Budapest: Eötvös Lorand University.
<http://www.doktori.btk.elt.hu/lingv/vandorjudit/thesis.pdf>
- Venuti, L. (2003). *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge.
- Wright, B. (2010). "Pride and Prejudice"—An analysis of narrative technique in Jane Austen's classic novel.
[http://EzineArticles.com/?expert=Ben H](http://EzineArticles.com/?expert=Ben+H)